

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §112. Claims 1-8 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103. Claims 9-11 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. By the foregoing, claims 1-13 have been amended and new claim 14 is presented for consideration.

By the foregoing, the specification has been amended to add section headings as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter is added.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the claims are indicated as being replete with indefinite language. Accordingly, claims 1-13 have been amended to correct the indefinite language. The rejection is believed to be overcome, and withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meader et al. U.S. Patent 5 863 050 in view of Jones et al. U.S. Patent 6 557 866. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)

Meadar et al. '050 discloses a snowboard insert plate that is molded within the core of the snowboard. Elements to be mounted to the surface of the snowboard must be secured with threaded fasteners that are inserted through the surface of the snowboard into the prethreaded insert within the core. Jones et al. '866 discloses a snowboard binding that is secured to a top surface of the snowboard by a number of screws or bolts into threaded mounting holes in the board. Neither Meader et al. '050 nor Jones et al. '866 discloses a sliding board having an element for arrangement at least one binding element, said element being connected to the sliding board body by an anchoring element integrated into the core of the board when it is foamed, as required by claim 1.

In each case, Meader et al. '050 and Jones et al. '866 require that the mounting mechanism attached to the surface of the snowboard be mounted by threaded fasteners. Neither Meader et al. '050 nor Jones et al. '866, nor the combination thereof, further disclose the sliding board having anchoring elements which are in one piece with the element comprising a rail type guide element, as required by claim 5.

In like manner, Meader et al. '050 and Jones et al. '866 do not disclose the method for producing a sliding board wherein at least one guide element for arranging and guiding a binding element is attached, by means of at least one anchoring element passed through at least one opening in the preformed upper shell, with the core then foamed, so that the anchoring element is connected to the core when the foam hardens, as required by claim 8. Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and should be considered patentable therewith. Claims 12-13 depend from claim 8 and should be patentable therewith. In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 and 12-13 and reconsideration of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 9-11 is acknowledged. Claim 9 has been rewritten in independent form, to include all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 10-11 depend from claim 9. New claim 14 depends from claim 10, and should be considered allowable therewith.

In light of the foregoing, the claims remaining in the application should be considered in condition for allowance, and early notice of allowability is courteously solicited. If necessary to further prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' representatives listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



David G. Boutell

DGB/DJW/jas

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL
& TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631
Phone: (269) 381-1156
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24 323
David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25 072
Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32 549
Mark L. Maki	Reg. No. 36 589
Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40 694
Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36 328
Steven R. Thiel	Reg. No. 53 685
Donald J. Wallace	Reg. No. 43 977
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24 949

Encl: Postal Card

136.07/05